

REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 3, 4, 13-16 and 21-30 are pending in this application, the independent claims being claims 3, 21, 27, 29 and 30. By this Amendment, claims 3, 4, 13-16 and 21-26 are amended and claims 27-30 are newly presented.

SUMMARY OF ACTION

In the Official Action, claims 4, 13-16 and 22-26 were objected to on formal grounds, and claims 3, 4, 13-16 and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Claims 3, 4, 13-16 and 21-26 further variously were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,796,951 (Hamner), The Minasi publication (Minasi, Mastering Windows NT Server 4 (5th Ed. 1998)), the Person publication (Person, Using Windows 95 (1995)), U.S. Published Application No. 2001/0052995 A1 (Idehara) and U.S. Patent No. 5,414,809 (Hogan). The Examiner also objected to the Amendment filed January 31, 2005 under 35 U.S.C. 132, as introducing new matter. Finally, the Examiner again requested that Applicants submit English translations of the Japanese Priority documents in the present application.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections respectfully are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

NEW MATTER OBJECTION TRAVERSED

The objection to the Amendment filed January 31, 2005, as introducing new matter, respectfully is traversed. Applicants submit that support for the proposed amendments may be found in the original specification, e.g., at page 28, lines 4-18. As stated therein,

"The proxy 116 and the stub 602 perform *abstraction of the communication path* that connects the computer 100 with the computer 600 via the network 500, relative to the upper level application unit 112 and the interface 114, when the application

unit 112 transmits a diversity of *control information* and data to and from Digital Camera A across the network 500."

(emphasis added). Thus, Applicants submit the original specification supports the claimed communications path abstraction with respect to a difference in control procedure. In the portion stressed by the Examiner, the specification *further* discloses

"The device controller 604, *on the other hand*, absorbs the difference in device class (type of the device) of the corresponding device (in this case, Digital Camera A) and performs abstraction of the device (abstraction of the hardware) relative to the application unit 112 and the interface 114 located on the upper level."

(emphasis added). Applicants submit that the amendments are supported by the original disclosure, and that no new matter has been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection/rejection respectfully are requested.

FORMAL CLAIM AMENDMENTS

The formal objection and rejection of the claims respectfully are traversed. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the objection and rejection, claims 3, 4, 13-16 and 21-26 have been amended more clearly to recite various novel features of the claimed invention, with particular attention to the Examiner's comments. In this regard, careful review of the claims confirms that proper antecedent basis may be found in the prior claims for each of the terms objected to by the Examiner, and many of such terms have been left unamended; nevertheless, certain terms objected to by the Examiner have been amended to provide literal correspondence and/or better clarity. Applicants submit that these amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the formal objection and rejection respectfully are requested.

CLAIMED INVENTION

The rejections of the claims over the cited art respectfully are traversed. The present invention relates to a novel device retrieving apparatus that retrieves a device mapped to a desired person among a plurality of devices present on a network.

In one aspect, as recited in independent claim 3, the claimed invention relates to a device retrieving apparatus comprising a display unit having a screen, an input unit that is used to externally input an instruction, and an application unit. The application unit causes individual symbols corresponding to individuals (see, e.g., individual thumbnail photographs corresponding to individuals 'Nancy Smith' and 'Kevin Martin'; Figs. 7(a) and 7(b) and the corresponding text at page 4, lines 15-25) and device symbols corresponding to devices to be displayed on the screen of said display unit. When an instruction is given externally via the input unit to map a desired first device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person, the application unit:

- specifies an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the mapped individual symbol as a specific individual description,
- gains access to a database that is present in a server connected to the network,
- obtains a device description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information, which is stored in the database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing the plurality of devices present on the network, and
- causes at least one of the obtained device description and a second device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of the display unit.

In another aspect, as recited in independent claim 21, the device retrieving apparatus also comprises a display unit having a screen, an input unit that is used to externally input an instruction, and a control unit, and the control unit causes individual symbols corresponding to individuals and device symbols corresponding to devices to be displayed on the screen of said display unit. In this aspect, when an instruction is given externally via the input unit to map a desired first device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person, the control unit:

- specifies an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the mapped individual symbol as a specific individual description,
- gains access to a database that is present in an apparatus connected to the network or in the device retrieving apparatus,
- obtains a device description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information, which is stored in the database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing the plurality of devices present on the network, and
- causes at least one of the obtained device description and a second device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of the display unit.

PRIOR ART DISTINGUISHED

Applicants submit that the prior art fails to anticipate the claimed invention. Moreover, Applicants submit that there are differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art, such that the subject matter taken as a whole would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

The Hamner '951 patent relates to a system for displaying information relating to a computer network including association devices with tasks performed by those devices, and

illustrates in Fig. 2A and describes in the corresponding written disclosure at column 4, lines 1-32, a user interface including an example of a logical view 200 display for a typical network. However, Applicants submit that the Hamner '951 patent fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed features of the claimed invention. Specifically, Applicants submit that the Hamner '951 patent fails to disclose or suggest at least the claimed feature of displaying *individual symbols corresponding to individuals*. Rather, in the Hamner '951 network system the logical view 200 includes a *device* window 201 and a task window 202; *devices and device groups* in the network are represented in the device window 201, where each *device group* and each *device* is represented with its name and a bitmap (icon). Further, the Hamner '951 patent discloses a network user interface in which double-clicking on a device group bitmap (icon) with a cursor control device will cause the device group to be expanded to a tree hierarchy consisting of all the *devices* within the group; further selection of a specific *device*, e.g., by clicking on a specific *device icon* within the device group causes a task window 202 to display tasks/categories that can be performed upon the selected *device*. Nowhere does the Hamner '951 patent disclose or suggest the features of displaying *individual symbols corresponding to individuals*, let alone the feature of displaying *individual symbols corresponding to individuals* **and** device symbols corresponding to devices, as disclosed in the present application and recited in claims 3 and 21. Nor does the Hamner '951 patent disclose or suggest the specific combination of features of mapping a desired device symbol to a specific individual symbol, and obtaining and displaying individual description information and/or device description information relating to the mapping, as disclosed in the present application and recited in claims 3 and 21 and discussed above.

The Minasi publication relates to operating a Windows NT Server, and in Chapter 6, pages 344, *et seq.*, discloses how an administrator of an NT server may (1) create accounts for network users and define what those users can do on the network, (2) create shared areas on

the server disks and define who can access those areas, (3) create shared printers and define access to them, and (4) set up desktop computers to connect with the server. In creating such accounts, shared areas, shared printer accesses, and connections on the server, the server manager utilizes a user interface that creates lists of users and user groups, and corresponding information for such users and user groups. Referring for example, to Figs. 6.1 and 6.15, these lists may include icons/symbols, user names, corresponding full names for the users, and/or descriptive information relating to each user or user group. However, Applicants submit that the Minasi publication fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed features of the claimed invention. Rather, in the Minasi publication, the server manager uses symbols/icons that correspond to user types/categories in association with a specific user name, for each user name in each user type/category (group types/categories in association with each user group name, for each user group). For example, in Fig. 6.15, each individual user is designated by the combination of a same icon (a human head) and the individual user's name; each user group is designated by the combination of a (same) group icon and the user group name. Thus, in each case the Minasi publication uses a symbol/icon to represent a user type or user group type. Nowhere does the Minasi publication disclose or suggest the feature of causing individual symbols corresponding to individuals to be displayed, as disclosed in the present application and recited in claims 3 and 21. Nor does the Minasi publication disclose or suggest the specific combination of features of mapping a desired device symbol to a specific individual symbol, and obtaining and displaying individual description information and/or device description information relating to the mapping, as disclosed in the present application and recited in claims 3 and 21 and discussed above. Nor is the Minasi publication believed to add anything to the Hamner '951 patent that would make obvious the claimed invention.

The Person publication relates to operation of the Windows 95 operating system, and discloses various ways of implementing the drag-and-drop operation function. The Person publication specifically identifies the functions of (1) dragging an icon of a file and dropping it on a program icon, where the program starts and loads that file. (2) dragging and dropping files to move, transfer or copy the files (3) dragging and dropping a file on a printer icon to print the file (4) dragging and dropping a table from a spreadsheet into a word processing document. However, without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's characterizations of the Person publication, Applicants submit that the Person publication fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed features of the claimed invention. Nowhere does the Person publication disclose or suggest the feature of causing individual symbols corresponding to individuals to be displayed, as disclosed in the present application and recited in claims 3 and 21. Nor does the Person publication disclose or suggest the specific combination of features of mapping a desired device symbol to a specific individual symbol, and obtaining and displaying individual description information and/or device description information relating to the mapping, as disclosed in the present application and recited in claims 3 and 21 and discussed above. Nor is the Person publication believed to add anything to the Hamner '951 patent and/or the Minasi publication that would make obvious the claimed invention.

The Idehara '995 publication relates to an input-output apparatus selecting method for a network system, and was cited for its disclosure of a database in a server connected to a network. Without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's characterizations of the Idehara '995 publication, Applicants submit that the Idehara '995 publication fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed features of the claimed invention. Nowhere does the Idehara '995 publication disclose or suggest the feature of causing individual symbols corresponding to individuals to be displayed, as disclosed in the present application and

recited in claims 3 and 21. Nor does the Idehara '995 publication disclose or suggest the specific combination of features of mapping a desired device symbol to a specific individual symbol, and obtaining and displaying individual description information and/or device description information relating to the mapping, as disclosed in the present application and recited in claims 3 and 21 and discussed above. Nor is the Idehara '995 publication believed to add anything to the Hamner '951 patent, the Minasi publication and/or the Person publication that would make obvious the claimed invention.

The Hogan '809 patent relates to graphical display of data, and was cited for its disclosure, e.g., in Fig. 5 and the written disclosure at column 46, line 60 to column 55, line 10, of individual position-related information with regard to mapping of positions related to individuals to the individual descriptions (e.g., displaying, entering, mapping and storing of individual floor location for an individual). Without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's characterizations of the Hogan '809 patent, Applicants submit that the Hogan '809 patent fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed features of the claimed invention. Nowhere does the Hogan '809 patent disclose or suggest the feature of causing individual symbols corresponding to individuals to be displayed, as disclosed in the present application and recited in claims 3 and 21. Nor does the Hogan '809 patent disclose or suggest the specific combination of features of mapping a desired device symbol to a specific individual symbol, and obtaining and displaying individual description information and/or device description information relating to the mapping, as disclosed in the present application and recited in claims 3 and 21 and discussed above. Nor is the Hogan '809 patent believed to add anything to the Hamner '951 patent, the Minasi publication, the Person publication and/or the Idehara '995 publication that would make obvious the claimed invention.

In summary, since none of the cited references discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed features or combination of features, no combination of such references could disclose or suggest such features and combination of features.

For the above reasons, Applicants submit that claims 3 and 21 are allowable over the cited art. Claims 4, 13-16 and 22-26 depend from claims 3 and 21, and are believed allowable for the same reasons. Moreover, each of the dependent claims recited additional features in combination with the features of its respective base claim, and is believed allowable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims respectfully is requested.

NEWLY PRESENTED CLAIMS

Newly presented claims 27-30 have been added to provide Applicants with an additional scope of protection commensurate with the disclosure. No new matter has been added.

Applicants believe claims 27-30 are allowable over the prior art of record. Favorable consideration of claims 27-30 respectfully is requested.

CLAIM FOR PRIORITY

Finally, in a formal matter, Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's request that Applicants file English translations of the Japanese Priority Documents in the present application, but respectfully decline the Examiner's request at this time as not required, for the following reasons:

- As clearly stated in the MPEP, "The papers required are the claim for priority and the certified copy of the foreign application." (MPEP 201.14(b)). Applicants have made a claim for priority and certified copies of the Japanese Priority documents are on file, as previously acknowledged by the Office.

- "The only times during *ex parte* prosecution that the examiner considers the merits of an applicant's claim of priority is when a reference is found with an effective date between the date of the foreign filing and the date of filing in the United States and when an interference situation is under consideration." (MPEP 201.15) Where the examiner cites a reference that has an effective date in the stated time period, "The Applicant in his or her reply *may* argue the rejection if it is of such a nature that it can be argued, *or* present the foreign papers for the purpose of overcoming the date of the reference." (MPEP 201.15). At this time, the Examiner has not cited/applied any reference that has an effective date in the stated time period. In the Action, the Examiner suggests that such a reference *may* exist. If the Examiner is aware of such a reference, or becomes aware of such a reference, then Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite and apply such reference so that Applicants may consider it.

- Applicants choose not to perfect the claim for priority by submitting an English translation at this time because Applicants do not at this time rely on the priority date to remove a reference as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) or §102(a).

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action, and submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the claims and passage to issue of the present application at the Examiner's earliest convenience earnestly are solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Christopher Philip Wrist
Registration No. 32,078

JAO:CPW/eks

Date: July 15, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461